

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8                   AT SEATTLE

9                   UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

10                  Plaintiff,

11                  v.

12                  GREGORY TIFT,

13                  Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:20-cr-00168-JCC

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
DELETE POLYGRAPH  
REQUIREMENT FROM  
APPEARANCE BOND**

13                  Defendant moves the Court to remove the requirement he submit to polygraph testing.  
14 Dkt. 107. The Court ordered the condition in October 2020. Defendant has not contested the  
15 condition until March 2020, when the Pretrial Office directed Defendant submit to a polygraph  
16 exam. Defendant declined to submit to the requested polygraph and told the Pretrial Office he  
17 would file a motion to remove the condition.

18                  Defendant contends the Court should remove the condition because it is an overly  
19 burdensome financial and logistical hardship because it would take Defendant a total of 90  
20 minutes to drive to the polygrapher's office in Mt. Vernon and back home, and because the  
21 polygrapher charges \$250.00. Defendant also contends polygraphs are unreliable, he shouldn't  
22 be asked questions about his pending charges, and no polygraph is need because he has been a  
23 "model example of pretrial release."

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO DELETE  
POLYGRAPH REQUIREMENT FROM  
APPEARANCE BOND - 1

The Court rejects these arguments. The appearance bond requires Defendant to submit to polygraph examination no more than on a quarterly basis. Driving back and forth to the exam and paying \$250 on this basis is not overly burdensome. Defendant's concern about the reliability of exam is not a grounds to discard the condition; it is an issue that will arise if any if only deception is noted in any examination. Defendant implies he will be asked potentially incriminating question, i.e., "a pretrial discovery interview." He proceeds *pro se* and as his own lawyer needs to address those issues if they ever arise. The Court accordingly ORDERS:

- (1) The motion to amend bond, Dkt 107, is DENIED.

(3) The clerk shall provide a copy of this order to all parties and the U.S. Probation and Pretrial Office.

DATED this 24<sup>th</sup> day of May 2022.

---

  
BRIAN A. TSUCHIDA  
United States Magistrate Judge